

REMARKS

In the May 20, 2005 Office Action, the Examiner noted that claims 3-15, 18, 19, and 21-25 were pending in the application; objected to claims 4 and 7 as dependent from a rejected base claim; and rejected claims 3-15, 18, 19 and 21-25 under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,023,773 to Baum et al. (Reference A in the September 3, 2004 Office Action). It is assumed that claims 4 and 7 were not intended to be listed as rejected 35 USC § 102(b), since the last paragraph on page 4 of the Office Action stated that these claims recited allowable subject matter. Claims 3-15, 18, 19, and 21-25 remain in the case. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On page 3 of the Office Action, it was asserted that Baum et al. disclosed the limitations recited in claim 21 at column 22, line 5 to column 25, line 67. No indication was provided regarding where in these nearly four columns of text Baum et al. disclosed the features recited in claim 21. It is submitted that this is an improper rejection for failure to meet the requirement of 37 CFR § 1.104(c)(2) that "[t]he pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained" and "the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable." It is submitted that it is "practicable" to designate the teaching with more specificity than identifying four columns of contiguous text.

Given the lack of specificity in the Office Action, this Response relies upon Applicant's best understanding of Baum et al. Nothing has been found in the cited portion or elsewhere in Baum et al. of "forming an accessing cryptographic value for each accessing process, and comparing the accessing cryptographic value with the cryptographic value stored in the process file for each accessing process listed in the process file" (claim 21, lines 10-12), where "the process file is separate from the program and includes a cryptographic value that uniquely identifies each process" (claim 21, lines 4-6).

Instead of "forming an accessing cryptographic value for each accessing process" (claim 21, line 10), Baum et al. discloses the use of "a 16-bit extended authorization index (EAX) in control register 8" (column 7, lines 46-47) and "an access-list entry authorization index (ALEAX)" (column 7, lines 49-50) in an access list which "may be either a dispatchable-unit access list (DUAL) or a primary access list (PSAL)" (column 7, lines 36-37). These terms are discussed in slightly more detail with reference to Fig. 3 at column 12, lines 3-29). Baum et al. discloses that "the entry of the authority table which corresponds to the value of EAX in control register 8 may be used to determine if a program is authorized to access the address base" (column 18, lines 16-19), but no suggestion has been found that the value of the EAX is the result of "forming an

accessing cryptographic value" (claim 21, line 10). Instead, Baum et al. teaches that when "the E bit is equal to 1, the entry EAX (EEAX) is placed in control register 8 at 75" (column 20, lines 15-16) where "75" refers to one of the blocks in Fig. 16.

The only source of the EAX that has been found in Baum et al. is an entry-table entry (ETE) illustrated in Fig. 8 and at the top of Fig. 16. As described at column 15, lines 16-21, the "entry EAX" or "EEAX" is used "to replace the current EAX in control register 8 as part of the stacking PC operation" (column 15, lines 18-19) when bit 133, "an extended-authorization-index control (E)" (column 15, lines 16-17), has a value of 1. The entry-table entry illustrated in Fig. 8 is one of the tables "used by the MAS facility to establish linkage for transferring control between programs in either the same or different address spaces" (column 14, lines 32-34). The "entry table is established at the entry-table address, each entry of which contains entry information for a program to be called" (column 3, lines 57-60) which is conventionally used in a dual address (DAS) system as disclosed in U.S. Patents 4,430,705; 4,366,537 and 4,500,952 (see column 3, lines 1-7). According to the Summary of the Invention Section of Baum et al. "the authority of each program is prescribed in the entry tables, and these are managed by the control program" (column 8, lines 12-14). The Descriptions of the Preferred Embodiment states that "[e]ach service provider that provides PC routines owns one or more entry tables for defining the service provider's routines" (column 14, lines 37-39). "Each entry in an entry table defines one PC routine, including its entry point ... [and] operating characteristics" (column 14, lines 42-43). No suggestion has been found that any portion of the entry table, including the EEAX in an ETE is formed as a cryptographic value as recited in claim 21. Therefore, it is submitted that claim 21 and claims 3-14 which depend therefrom patentably distinguish over Baum et al.

The remaining independent claims 22-25 all recite "forming an accessing cryptographic value" and therefore, claims 22-25 and claims 18 and 19 which depend from claim 23 patentably distinguish over Baum et al. for the reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, it is submitted that it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Baum et al. to utilize cryptographic values in the manner recited in claims 21-25. According to its title, the purpose of Baum et al. is to provide "selective program access to data in multiple address spaces." Thus, the access list is used in Baum et al. "to grant or prohibit a program's access to address space" (column 7, lines 55-56) during the execution of a program (see, for example, column 8, lines 22-27; column 10, lines 7-16; and column 11, lines 25-29). It is submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Baum et al. "for protecting several programs from unauthorized access by processes" (e.g., claim 1, lines 1-2) by "at least

one of starting and continuing execution of the accessing process only if said comparing determines the match between the accessing cryptographic value and the cryptographic value stored in the process file for the accessing process" (e.g., claim 21, last three lines). The method taught by Baum et al. only discloses controlling access to data, not whether processes should execute. Therefore, it is submitted that the independent claims are not obvious from Baum et al.

Summary

It is submitted that Baum et al. does not teach or suggest the features of the present claimed invention. Thus, it is submitted that claims 3-15, 18, 19 and 21-25 are in a condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the claims and an early Notice of Allowance are earnestly solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 8/22/05

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,106

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501